

# AGC/WSDOT ROADWAY TEAM

Meeting Minutes: April 26, 2007 Meeting

**Attending:** 

X	Frank Scarsella		Scott Droppelman		Bill Grady
	Scott Stephens		Bob Glenn		Dan Glover
	James Prouty		Dan Howell	X	Brenden Johnson
X	Ron Reilly				
X	Jim Spaid		Al Dyer		Mike Morishige
X	Gil McNabb		Ken Stone		Bob Romine
X	Nancy Boyd	X	Casey Liles	X	Kurt Williams
X	Cathy Nicholas				

# Minutes of March 29, 2007 meeting:

# **Minutes of other Team Meetings:**

The meeting minutes for the AGC Administration Team meeting held on February 16, 2007 were passed out as well as the meeting minutes from the AGC Structures Team held on March 2, 2007, was passed out.

## **Old Business**

**Pavement Marking Removal -** Continue discussion of special use GSPs with Ron Reilly of Apply-a-Line.

Jim handed out copies of alternative specifications Draft A, B and C, to section 8-22.3(6) Removal of Pavement Markings and copies of the FHWA/WSDOT Pavement Marking Removal Issues and Solutions Joint Review, Final Report, September 2006.

Jim noted that the 3 drafts of Section 8-22.3(6) Removal of Pavement Markings allowed designers to address specific conditions.

Ron Reilly noted that surface conditions dictate the best stripe removal method with grinder being the most productive and efficient as there is less exposure to traffic [for work crews]. If the ultimate surface is going to be overlaid then Ron recommended grinders are allowed. Ron noted that shot blasters are the most ineffective as they are fairly slow and the machines are high maintenance. Hydro-blasting is very effective and has been used on a wide variety of projects statewide; with a drawback disposing of the water can be expensive. Hydro-blasting works very well on concrete, but with some markings such as methyl, and thermoplastic hydro-blasting is very slow and grinding is the most effective way to remove the markings. Ron noted that every kind of removal leaves some kind of ghost stripe.

Gil noted that with concrete no matter what method used will leave ghost markings and other states use black around border of markings to such as white stripe to help permanent markings stand out.

Ron noted in California that black paint is used between double yellow strip to make it standout. Ron also recommended that a water pressure limit be put in the specifications for hydro-blasting, with a 40,000 psi max being allowed and Ron noted he has specifications that could be looked at.

Jim asked Ron to send a copy of the example equipment specification.

Ron also noted that Idaho DOT requires a test section for stripe removal on projects, which is done on the first days stripe removal and given approval to proceed or not the results of the stripe removal test. The decision to proceed or not is given immediately following the stripe removal test section operation.

**National Historic Preservation Act Compliance -** Issues under discussion at WSDOT. Martin Palmer of N W Region Environmental.

Jim introduced Martin Palmer, NW Region Environmental Manager, and handed out National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 Compliance for Staging/Storage/Disposal Areas and Materials Sources and recapped concern with using Federal money on private property to support state construction project that have Federal money in them.

Martin reviewed section 106 and 404 highlighting cultural resources and that using Federal dollars to support activities such as private land developed to use as contractor staging, stockpiling and storage areas used solely to support to support the construction project. Martin noted that consistency was needed a consistent, cost effective way to implement this on projects and outlined three alternatives.

- A. **Design Oriented Approach** WSDOT identifies staging, storage, material sources and disposal areas during the design phase. The site(s) would be obtained and cleared for cultural resources and other environmental issues.
- B. **Super-sized APE Approach** During the design phase, WSDOT determines a larger area of potential effect that accommodates anticipated contractor needs. This approach would identify higher and lower risk areas for finding cultural resources. A contractor staging area located within the larger APE could be cleared in less time through an amendment to the report.
- C. Contractor Selection Approach The contractor selects the site(s) and conducts cultural resource survey, and provides information to enable WSDOT to complete the Section 106 process for the selected areas. If the selected site is already in use commercially, such as parking lot area, would probably be exempt. Other sites may require as much as two months or more to clear, depending on the site and the amount of development that may be necessary for the contractor to utilize it.

Frank Scarsella noted that Idaho DOT requires contractor to submit proposed office and yard site for approval prior to use. And asked how long process would take.

Martin noted that a small site could be done within a week, tribes typically need up to 30 days, SHPO needs another 30 days.

Group discussed availability of archeologist, and the need to get area reviewed quickly. Martin noted that the NW Region archeologist would be available to help in other Regions.

Brenden Johnson of KLB asked why private property used by contractor has to have archeology review. Martin explained that this applies to Federal dollars and comes down to sole use of property is to support WSDOT project with Federal funds then Section 106 applies.

Cathy Nicholas noted a court case in Arizona has led to this broad interpretation.

Group discussed that WSDOT may need to use something like Idaho DOT, i.e. contractor submits staging area to WSDOT which reviews and approves the area.

Frank noted that it would be a good option to allow contractors to find their own yard.

Martin asked for input on the proposal in the next couple weeks.

Casey Liles noted that cleared areas need to be shown clearly so it can be bid. Jim Spaid noted addressing a larger area of potential effect makes good sense in that the cultural resource report can be amended with the addition of the contractor site during construction.

Martin noted we need to try this out on three projects before doing this on all projects and step into this process.

Jim Spaid will collect comments from the group.

#### **New Business**

## Section 5-05.3(19) Approach Slabs - Move to Section 6-02

Kurt handed out proposed specification to Section 5-05.3(19) Approach Slabs that will move approach slabs to Section 6-02. By doing this approach slabs will have a nominal maximum aggregate size requirement (1 inch), have a concrete specific for approach slabs (4000A) as well as clear requirements for curing and finishing. Kurt noted that this was being done to treat reinforced concrete approach slabs more as a bridge deck. Kurt noted that this specification has been reviewed by the AGC Structural team, The NW-American Concrete Pavement Association as well as the Washington Aggregate and Concrete Association and the only comments so far were why this wasn't done sooner. Kurt asked for comments on the proposal from the group. There were no questions or comments at this time.

## Other items - from the "floor"

Jim noted that there is concern with the use of plywood for temporary signs, specifically the type of sheeting being used.

Frank noted that Scarcella has a lot of plywood signs and there is a concern with theft when temporary aluminum signs are used.

Jim noted there may be more discussion on this issue.

## **Other Business**

# **Discussion Topics**

- GPS Use by Contractors (A1 Dyer 1/14/05 mtg notes)
- Shoulder Rock further discussion of method of payment.
- Longitudinal edge joint
- Testing storm sewer pipe
- Aggregate substitutions
- Documentation requirements for consumables
- Pavement Marking issues (June 17, 2004, and May 18, 2006 mtg notes)
- Environmental Compliance Lead (2117/05 mtg notes)
- SEWalls Alignment tolerances for block walls (Bill Grady -- 2/17/05 mtg notes)
- Chitosan-Enhanced Sand Filtration System draft special provision
- Concrete grinding and the pick up and disposal of the resulting slurry (9/21/06 mtg notes)

**Next Meeting Date -May 24, 2007**